

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to an *Official Action* that issued in this case on April 30, 2007. In that Action, the Examiner found as follows with respect to originally-filed claims 1-38:

- That claims 10-17, 21, and 24-28 are objected to because of informalities.
- That claims 7-9, 18-20, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 USC §112, ¶2 as being indefinite for antecedent problems.
- That claims 32, 37, and 38 are rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 3,611,274 to Low *et al.*
- That claims 33-36 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being obvious over Low *et al.* and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,821,159 to Munger, Jr., *et al.*
- That claims 1-6 are allowed.

Responsive to the *Action*, applicant has amended claims 7, 18, and 29. Reconsideration is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Objection to Claims 10-17, 21 and 24-28

The Office notes that "Claim 10 recites the limitation 'said first hardware' in line 8" and asserts that "there is no further language that modifies this passage." The same objection was made as to claim 21.

Lines 6 and 7 of claim 10 and lines 4 and 5 of claim 21 recite:

| |
|--|
| a first adapter, wherein said first adapter contains <i>a first hardware</i> for storing a unique identifier; |
|--|

Applicant did not consider this clause to positively recite "a first hardware," although it was applicant's intent to do so. As a consequence, applicant included the language "said first hardware" in line 8 of claim 10 and in line 6 of claim 21 as a positive recitation thereof.

It is believed that these claims, as presented, are not objectionable. As a consequence, applicant requests that the objection to claims 10-17, 21, and 24-28 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 7-9, 18-20, and 29-31 under 35 USC §112, ¶2

The Office correctly noted that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the language "first unique identifier," as it appears in claims 7, 18, and 29. Responsive thereto, applicant has

amended these claims to delete the modifier "first" from this clause. These claims now recite "unique identifier," for which antecedent basis is present.

In view of the amendments to claims 7, 18, and 29, it is believed that the Section 112 rejections have been overcome. As a consequence, the Office is requested to withdraw the Section 112 rejection of claims 7-9, 18-20, and 29-31.

**Rejection of Claims 32, 37,
and 38 under 35 USC §102**

The Office rejected claims 32, 37, and 38 as being anticipated by Low *et al.*

Claim 32

Claim 32 recites:

An apparatus comprising a first adapter and a second adapter, wherein:
said first adapter couples a first port associated with a computer peripheral to said second adapter;
said second adapter couples said first adapter to a second port associated with a processor;
said first adapter comprises a first keyed-connector;
said second adapter comprises a second keyed-connector; and
said second keyed-connector mates with said first keyed-connector.

In its rejection of claim 32, the Office alleged that Low *et al.* anticipates the claim because:

- (1) "the missile processor circuits constitute a peripheral to a launch facility processor"
- (2) the "first adapter comprises a first keyed-connector" and the "second adapter comprises a second keyed-connector" and
- (3) the "second keyed-connector mates with said first keyed connector"

Applicant disagrees with these assertions.

Response to Allegation 1. The missile processor circuits are not a "peripheral to a launch facility processor." The internet dictionary "Wikipedia" defines a computer peripheral as:

A peripheral is a piece of computer hardware that is added to a host computer in order to expand its abilities. More specifically, the term is used to describe those devices that are optional in nature, as opposed to hardware that is either demanded or always required in principle.

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Computer_peripheral)

In the context of a *launch facility processor*, there is nothing optional about a missile processor circuit. It is true that the missile processor is not contained in the launch facility processor, but "location" is the defining attribute of a peripheral, as is clear from the definition. In fact, the *raison d'être* for the launch facility processor is the missile and its accompanying missile processor circuit. Devices such as a mouse, a keyboard, a printer, a monitor, external zip drive, external scanner or even internal devices such as a CD or DVD drive or internal modem are typical examples of a peripheral. In the context of a network and host computer, an additional lap top or desk top computer could be considered to be a peripheral.

Response to Allegations 2 and 3. Claim 32 recites that each "adapter" comprises a "keyed connector." As recited in claim 32 (and as shown in FIG. 4, wherein elements "404" and "408" are the keyed connectors), the keyed connectors couple or mate to one another.

FIG. 1 of Low *et al.* shows a breakaway connector "10," having a female connector unit "12" and a male connector unit "14." The female unit receives the male unit. The Office alleges that "the connectors are held by screws 18 which constitutes a keyed connector."

It is agreed that a screw is appropriately characterized as a "keyed connector." But the applicant disagrees that screws 18 of Low *et al.* meet the limitations of claim 32. In particular, as disclosed by Low *et al.* at col. 2, lines 43-48:

a protective plate 16 is positioned over the mated male and female units of the connector. Preferably, the plate 16 is secured in place by a plurality of screws 18 and is adapted to be removed from the connector 10 in order that access to the connector components readily may be acquired.

It should be clear that screws "18" do nothing more than hold a cover plate to female unit "12." Neither the cover plate nor the screws play a role in mating the connectors — female unit "12" and the male unit "14" — to one another.

Actually, as disclosed, at col. 3, line 74 – col. 4, line 5, it is screws "58" that secure the connectors to one another:

The female unit 12 and the male unit 14 are retained in a mated relationship through the use of a pair of oppositely directed locking pins 58...."

Furthermore, claim 32 requires that the "second keyed-connector mates with said first keyed connector." The only elements that are reasonably construed as "connectors" that

mate with each other in Low *et al.* are female unit "10" and male unit "14." But these connectors are not "keyed" connectors, as evidenced by the fact that screws "58" are required to retain them in mated relationship.

Since Low *et al.* does not disclose the limitations of claim 32, that claim is allowable over that reference. As a consequence, applicant requests that the Office withdraw the Section 102 rejection of claim 32 over Low *et al.*

Since claims 37 and 38 are dependent on claim 32, those claims are likewise allowable over Low *et al.*

Rejection of Claims 33-36 under 35 USC §102

The Office rejected claims 33-36 as being obvious over the combination of Low *et al.* and Munger, Jr., *et al.* The Office alleges that Low *et al.* teaches the apparatus of claim 32, but not the additional limitations of claims 33-36. But the Office alleges that Munger, Jr. *et al.*, in conjunction with certain motivation, renders the inventions recited in claims 33-36 obvious.

As previously discussed, Low *et al.* does not disclose the limitations of claim 32, nor does the combination of Low *et al.* and Munger, Jr. *et al.* Therefore, claims 33-36 are allowable based on their dependence on claim 32.

Conclusion

It is believed that claims 1-21 and 24-38 now presented for examination are in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully,
Robert James Howard et al.

By **/Wayne S. Breyer/**

Wayne S. Breyer

Reg. No. 38089

Attorney for Applicants

732-578-0103 x12

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.

Suite 250

100 Commons Way

Holmdel, NJ 07733

United States of America